arXiv:1704.02113v2 [hep-th] 19 Apr 2017

YITP-17-34

Symmetric configurations highlighted by collective quantum coherence

Dennis Obster[1,2]*, Naoki Sasakura[2]†

[1] *Institute for Mathematics, Astrophysics and Particle Physics, Radboud University, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen,The Netherlands*

[2] *Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kitashirakawa, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

April 20, 2017

Abstract

Recent developments in quantum gravity suggest the importance of Lorentzian treatment over Euclidean treatment for the emergence of macroscopic spacetimes. In this paper, we discuss another merit of the Lorentzian treatment: we argue that collective quantum coherence may provide a simple mechanism of highlighting symmetric configurations over chaotic backgrounds. After presenting the general framework of the mechanism, we show the phenomenon in some concrete simple examples in the randomly connected tensor network, which is tightly related to a certain model of quantum gravity, i.e., the canonical tensor model. We find large peaks at configurations with Lie-group symmetries as well as a preference for charge quantization, even in the Abelian case. In future study, this simple mechanism may provide a way to analyze the emergence of macroscopic spacetimes with global symmetries as well as various other symmetries existing in nature, which are usually postulated.

*dobster@science.ru.nl

†sasakura@yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

1 Introduction

In recent years, there have been some developments which suggest the importance of Lorentzian treatment in quantum gravity. One is the success of causal dynamical triangulation over dynamical triangulation [1]. The former takes into account the condition of causality, distinguishing Lorentzian spacetimes from the Euclidean ones, and has been shown to generate macroscopic spacetimes similar to de-Sitter spacetimes, which is a good approximation of our actual universe. On the other hand, no macroscopic emergent spaces have been found in the latter (Euclidean) model so far [2]. Another development is the argument by van Raamsdonk that quantum correlations are the essence of connectivity of classical spacetimes, which has been derived in the context of AdS/CFT correspondence [3]. This seems to imply that the quantum effects of a model for quantum gravity are crucial for the emergence of macroscopic spacetimes. It was also argued that Lorentzian path integral has some advantages over the Euclidean one in describing the wave function of universe in the mini-superspace approximation [4].

In this paper, we discuss another merit of Lorentzian treatment in quantum gravity: we argue that quantum coherence may provide a mechanism for the preference of configurations which are invariant under part of underlying symmetries. A number of models of quantum gravity assume that spaces (spacetimes) are generated from the dynamics of certain 'building-blocks'. The number of building-blocks of a macroscopic space is generally huge, and their dynamics would thus be complicated and chaotic. On the other hand, there exist various (approximate) symmetries in nature such as gauge symmetries, Lorentz invariance, de Sitter symmetry, and so on. It is not clear how such symmetries can emerge from such probably chaotic dynamics of building-blocks. This question would also be tightly related to the dynamics of the emergence of macroscopic spacetimes, since the de Sitter symmetry should be present almost instantly after the Big Bang (and also approximately in the present era), according to cosmological models [5]. Of course, it would be natural to impose that theories of quantum gravity should have underlying symmetries which can interchange building-blocks. However, it would be difficult to devise an explicit scenario of spontaneous breaking of the underlying symmetry to the existing symmetries in nature, because there exists a huge hierarchy between them. In this paper, we consider the problem rather in an opposite direction. Considering the recent emphasis on Lorentzian treatment in quantum gravity, we propose that quantum coherence may provide a mechanism to highlight symmetric configurations over chaotic backgrounds.

The phenomenon itself is quite common in a broad range of physics. One can find a similar phenomena even in high school text books. X-rays diffracted by a crystal have strong peaks in particular directions, each of which represents particular discrete translational symmetries of the crystal. Though our formalism presented in this paper is described in a different manner suited for our purpose, the aspect is very similar to the text book phenomenon: strong peaks appear in association with part of underlying symmetries.

The main purpose of this paper is to argue that, due to collective quantum coherence, such peak patterns associated to parts of underlying symmetries can actually occur in a large variety of systems, and we explicitly show the phenomenon in a model tightly related to quantum

gravity. After presenting a general framework of the mechanism in a manner suitable for our purpose, we consider the grand partition function of the randomly connected tensor network [6, 7, 8] with a Lorentzian modification: the exponent of an integrand is adjusted to be purely imaginary. It is known that the grand partition function of the randomly connected tensor network has a similar expression as the exact wave functions [9] of the canonical tensor model [10, 11], which is a tensor model [12, 13, 14] in the Hamilton formalism and studied as a model of quantum gravity. Though our final goal would be to use this mechanism in the context of the canonical tensor model, we restrict ourselves in this paper to general arguments and concrete demonstrations in simpler related situations and leave the application to the canonical tensor model for future study.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide the general argument of the mechanism in a setup which is common in a broad range of systems with underlying symmetries. We qualitatively argue that collective quantum coherence highlights configurations invariant under part of underlying symmetries of a system, and discuss some conditions which enhance the phenomenon. In Section 3, we explain the model we consider as an example. It is defined by a Lorentzian modification of the grand partition function of the randomly connected tensor network. In Section 4, we consider the $N = 3$ case of the model, and find strong peaks on $SO(2)$ symmetric configurations. In Section 5, the $N = 4$ case is considered. In this case, it turns out that there are two possibilities of highlighted symmetries, $SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$. We observe strong peaks on the configurations with those symmetries similarly to the results for $N = 3$. We also observe charge quantization in the case of $SO(2)$. The last section is devoted to a summary and future prospects. In the appendix, we show some details of the computations in the $N = 3$ case.

2 The mechanism

The setup of our mechanism is common in physics. We consider a quantity which can schematically be represented by

$$\Psi(Q) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} d\phi \; e^{iS(\phi,Q)}, \tag{1}$$

where ϕ and Q represent sets of multiple variables. Such quantities appear as path integrals, partition functions, wave functions, etc., with corresponding appropriate expressions of $\phi, Q, S(\phi, Q)$, and $\int_{\mathcal{C}} d\phi$. For instance in the context of quantizing general relativity, a wave function of a universe could be expressed in this form by considering $\int_{\mathcal{C}} d\phi$ and Q as integration over metrics on manifolds and metrics on their boundaries respectively. Later in this paper, we consider a discrete model defined by an expression like (1). For our purpose, it is essentially important that the integrand of (1) takes complex values with non-trivial phases in general. Thus, our setup must have Lorentzian characteristics rather than Euclidean: the integrand of (1) should not take just positive real values.

The class of theories we consider are assumed to have group symmetries in the following sense. For convenience, let us discretely label the variables ϕ, Q as ϕ_a $(a = 1, 2, \cdots, N)$ and

Q_i $(i = 1, 2, \cdots, M)$, respectively, while in general it is also possible to consider continuous labels such as spacetime coordinates. Let us assume that group transformations of ϕ and Q are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_g)_a &= R(g)_a{}^b \phi_b, \\ (Q_g)_i &= \tilde{R}(g)_i{}^j Q_j, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $R(g)$ and $\tilde{R}(g)$ are representations of a group G for elements g. For our purpose, it is necessary that neither of the representations, R nor $\tilde{R}$, are trivial. We do not assume R or $\tilde{R}$ to be irreducible, and they are therefore allowed to contain trivial representations as their parts in general. We assume that the integration and S are invariant as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{C}} d\phi_g &= \int_{\mathcal{C}} d\phi, \\ S(\phi_g, Q_g) &= S(\phi, Q), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for any $g \in G$. In particular, the assumptions imply the invariance of Ψ as

$$\Psi(Q_g) = \Psi(Q). \tag{4}$$

Now, a physical question which is obviously interesting is the locations of maxima of $|\Psi(Q)|^2$. For the simplicity of the following discussions, let us assume $S(\phi, Q)$ to be real. This is common in physics, but the assumption may not be necessary as long as the integrand can take various complex values with non-trivial phases. To illustrate the mechanism, let us consider a crude approximation of (1). This approximation is based on the principle of stationary phase. The principle states that the major contribution of a highly oscillatory integral comes from points where the phase function (in our case $S(\phi, Q)$) is stationary [15]. This approximation would thus be given by only picking up stationary points as

$$\Psi(Q) \sim \sum_{\sigma=1}^{n_{crit}} A_\sigma e^{iS(\phi^\sigma, Q)}, \tag{5}$$

where $\phi = \phi^\sigma$ $(\sigma = 1, 2, \cdots, n_{crit})$ are the critical points defined by

$$\left.\frac{\partial S(\phi, Q)}{\partial \phi_a}\right|_{\phi=\phi^\sigma} = 0, \quad (a = 1, 2, \cdots, N), \tag{6}$$

and A_σ are the prefactors obtained by performing Gaussian integrations around each critical point[1]. Here, for simplicity, it is assumed that the critical points are isolated for generic values of Q. If M and N are sufficiently large and $S(\phi, Q)$ is not too simple[2], expression (5) suggests that $\Psi(Q)$ has the following properties. One is that, for generic values of Q, there would exist a substantial number n_{crit} of critical points, and there would be no strong correlations among

[1]The expression with the sum over critical points can be sophisticated by a method based on the Picard-Lefschetz theory. For instance, see Section 3 of [16] and references therein for more details.

[2] For instance, $S(\phi, Q)$ should not be a quadratic function of ϕ and Q.

values of phase $S(\phi^\sigma, Q)$ of different critical points. Therefore, $\Psi(Q)$ will be suppressed by mutual cancellations among the contributions of all the critical points. It is also likely that, for generic values of Q, $\Psi(Q)$ behaves almost randomly as a function of Q due to uncorrelated behaviors of $S(\phi^\sigma, Q)$ among the critical points. These properties would make it unlikely that there exist sensible observables in such generic regions of values of Q. Though such situations would not be generally true for all the possible cases, the kinds of cancellations and randomness mentioned above are expected to naturally occur, when M and N (and n_{crit} as well) are sufficiently large and $S(\phi, Q)$ is not too simple.[3]

On the other hand, there exist values of Q where $|\Psi(Q)|$ seems to take larger values. Let us consider a value of Q, say Q^H, which is invariant under a subgroup H of G:

$$Q^H_h = Q^H, \ {}^\forall h \in H \subset G. \tag{7}$$

Then, for such a Q^H, critical points exist along the trajectories of the group action H:

$$(\phi^\sigma_h)_a = R(h)_a{}^b (\phi^\sigma)_b, \ {}^\forall h \in H \subset G. \tag{8}$$

This is an immediate consequence of the invariance in (3). The representation $R(H)$ is generally reducible, and therefore a critical point ϕ^σ may be contained in the part of the trivial representation of $R(H)$. In that case, the critical point is usually an isolated single point (except if it happens to coincide with another critical point, which might or might not have some deeper reasons). Otherwise, they form a set of critical points, on which the group action H is non-trivially represented. For simplicity of our discussions below, let us assume H and G both are Lie groups. The discussions below can obviously be generalized to finite groups and a similar mechanism will hold if the orders of the groups are large enough. In the case of Lie groups, the set of critical points on which H acts non-trivially form a continuous set of critical points. Taking into account the differences of the two classes of critical points, $\Psi(Q^H)$ can now be represented by

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(Q^H) \sim \sum_{\sigma:\text{non-trivial}} \int_H dh \left| \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial h} \right| A_\sigma e^{iS(\phi^\sigma, Q^H)} \\ + \sum_{\sigma:\text{trivial}} A_\sigma e^{iS(\phi^\sigma, Q^H)}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the first term denotes the contributions from the continuous critical points, while the latter contains the contributions from the isolated ones. Here A_σ in the first term is determined by the Gaussian integrations over the transverse directions to the group trajectories. One important matter is that the phase is constant along each group trajectory, because $S(\phi^\sigma_h, Q^H) = S(\phi^\sigma_h, Q^H_h) = S(\phi^\sigma, Q^H)$ for ${}^\forall h \in H$, and similarly for A_σ.

[3]This aspect seems to have a certain philosophical similarity with the random dynamics developed in [17], since any sophisticated discrete model would give some preferred symmetric states. There is a difference, however, since in our mechanism the model which is chosen will influence the symmetries which are highlighted, whereas random dynamics dictates that the specific model should not matter much for the emergent symmetries at large scales. It would be interesting to compare our mechanism and theirs to a deeper extent.

In (9), there exist two main reasons for which $|\Psi(Q^H)|$ may become relatively large due to the continuous critical points. One is that phases are constant along each group trajectory. Therefore, continuous critical points on each trajectory contribute coherently to $\Psi(Q^H)$. The other is that, when Q reaches Q^H, some of the isolated critical points are connected by a group orbit generated by H to form a continuous set of critical points. Therefore, the number of critical points is enhanced from a finite number to a continuous infinite. No divergences are generally caused by that though for compact groups, as can be seen in the expression (9).

Expression (9) suggests some conditions for large enhancement. One is that the trajectories of continuous critical points should occupy large subspaces in the space of ϕ. Another is that the number of sets of continuous critical points should not be too large to avoid mutual cancellations among them. These conditions may be rephrased in that there exist a small number (ideally one) of continuous sets of critical points whose representations $R(H)\phi^\sigma$ have large dimensions. As for the dimension of the subgroup H, there seems to exist a tension between the following two factors, and it seems hard to say which factor wins. One is that a typical symmetric configuration Q^H tends to have a smaller dimensional subgroup H, because it is easier for Q to satisfy the condition (7) due to a smaller number of conditions imposed on Q. On the other hand, enhancement tends to become larger for a larger dimensional H, because the dimension of the group orbit of H in the space of ϕ is larger.

The preferences discussed above are consistent with the present form of the actual universe. Comparing to the large supposed symmetry which can interchange 'building-blocks' of spaces, the existing symmetries in nature are extremely small. On the other hand, the representation spaces of the existing symmetries are the universe itself (for instance, consider the translational symmetry), and the dimensions of the representations are extremely large: they should be in the order of the number of 'building-blocks'.

Lastly, we want to comment on an essential difference between the Lorentzian treatment and the Euclidean one. In the Euclidean treatment, preferred configurations are usually obtained by minimization of $S(\phi, Q)$, often referred to as ground states. Here, whether preferred configurations are symmetric or not is just an outcome, but is not relevant in determining them. On the other hand, in the Lorentzian treatment, quantum coherence is the essence rather than values of $S(\phi, Q)$, and symmetries play important roles in determining preferred configurations. This seems to imply an important paradigm change from Euclidean to Lorentzian: harmonies among many components are more important than each value of a single component.

3 The model

Our final aim for developing this formalism is to apply the highlighting mechanism discussed in the previous section to the canonical tensor model [10, 11], a model of quantum gravity, to explore the possibility of emergence of macroscopic spacetimes. On the other hand, the mechanism itself will generally hold in various settings with underlying symmetries. Therefore, to concentrate on the mechanism itself, we restrict ourselves to show the validity of the mechanism in some concrete simple examples connected to the canonical tensor model: we

consider the grand partition function of the randomly connected tensor networks [6, 7, 8] with a Lorentzian modification. In fact, this setting is not so far from the canonical tensor model [10, 11], since its known exact wave functions [9] have similar expressions.

The grand partition function [6] of the randomly connected tensor network is defined by

$$Z_T(Q) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} d\phi \; e^{S_T(\phi,Q)}, \tag{10}$$

where the integration region $\mathcal{C}$ is tilted from a real plane to a complex one to make the integration convergent [6], and

$$d\phi = \prod_{a=1}^{N} d\phi_a, \tag{11}$$

$$S_T(\phi, Q) = \phi^2 + Q\phi^3 \tag{12}$$

with short-hand notations, $\phi^2 = \phi_a\phi_a$ and $Q\phi^3 = Q_{abc}\phi_a\phi_b\phi_c$. Here Q_{abc} is assumed to be real and totally symmetric.

In this paper, we rather discuss a quantity which is similar but has a Lorentzian modification of multiplying the exponent by i,

$$\Psi_T(Q) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\phi \; e^{iS_T(\phi,Q)-\epsilon\phi^2}, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbb{R}^N$ denotes an N-dimensional real space, and $\epsilon > 0$ is a regularization parameter assuring the convergence of the integration for any real values of Q. In addition to the interest in the exact wave functions of the canonical tensor model, $\Psi_T(Q)$ may be regarded as the grand partition function of the randomly connected tensor network with imaginary parameters.

Note that $\Psi_T(Q)$ is obviously symmetric under the orthogonal group $G = O(N)$, and satisfies the conditions required in the previous section, where the representations are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_g)_a &= R(g)_a{}^b\phi_b, \\ (Q_g)_{abc} &= R(g)_a{}^d R(g)_b{}^e R(g)_c{}^f Q_{def} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

with $R(g)_a{}^b$ being the matrix of the (N-dimensional) vector representation of $G = O(N)$ for $g \in G$. The regularization parameter ϵ will generally be taken to be small positive values, but we will not discuss the details of its vanishing limit $\epsilon \to +0$. This is because $\Psi_T(Q)$ may have some singular behaviors in the limit $\epsilon \to +0$, when some of the components of Q vanish, and analyzing the details of such behaviors is not in the range of our main purpose of this paper: we are rather interested in showing the enhancement of (13) for symmetric Q, and, to see this, it is enough to take ϵ sufficiently small.

4 Simplest non-trivial case: $N = 3$

We will now discuss a concrete example of the mechanism at work. We will use the model defined by (13) in the case of $N = 3$. In this case (13) is invariant under transformations of the orthogonal group $G = O(3)$ and the totally symmetric real tensor Q_{abc} has 10 independent parameters. As mentioned above (7) we will now consider a subgroup $H \subset G$. The subgroup $H = SO(2)$ will be used with the following representation of its Lie algebra:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

The generator of $H = SO(2)$ can always be put into this form by performing an appropriate $G = O(3)$ transformation. Demanding (7) to hold leads to the following requirement for Q:

$$T_a{}^{a'} Q_{a'bc} + T_b{}^{b'} Q_{ab'c} + T_c{}^{c'} Q_{abc'} = 0. \tag{16}$$

This requirement generally holds for any Lie group generator and for any N. In the present case it restricts the tensor a lot, as there are only two independent parameters left:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{113} = Q_{223} &\equiv \frac{x}{3}, \\ Q_{333} &\equiv y, \\ \text{others} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

(12) is now written as:

$$S(\phi, x, y) = (\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2)(1 + x\phi_3) + \phi_3^2 + y\phi_3^3. \tag{18}$$

The critical points can now easily be computed using (6). There are two isolated critical points and a continuous set of critical points which is invariant under the group action of H:

$$\phi_1^\sigma = \phi_2^\sigma = \phi_3^\sigma = 0, \tag{19}$$

$$\phi_1^\sigma = \phi_2^\sigma = 0; \phi_3^\sigma = -\frac{2}{3y}, \tag{20}$$

$$\phi_1^{\sigma\,2} + \phi_2^{\sigma\,2} = \frac{2x - 3y}{x^3} \equiv r_0^2;\ \phi_3^\sigma = -\frac{1}{x}. \tag{21}$$

So for $x > 0, 2x > 3y$ or $x < 0, 2x < 3y$ there is a continuous set of critical points with topology S^1.[4] If we make r_0 large by taking $x \sim 0$ within these regions with finite y, the continuous set of critical points will occupy a large subspace in the space of ϕ, and $|\Psi(Q)|$ will become large.

[4]Complex valued critical points may also be relevant for the evaluation of Ψ according to the aforementioned method based on Picard-Lefschetz theory. Hence, in principle, the continuous critical points may become relevant even in the outside of these regions bounded by the inequalities. However, such contributions do not seem important in our examples, as we will see explicitly.

To see this explicitly, we can compute the contributions of the critical points by performing the Gaussian integrations around them, corresponding to (9). For large r_0 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(x,y) \approx \pi^{3/2} e^{i3\pi/4} \left(1 + i\left(\frac{3y}{2x-3y}\right) e^{i\frac{4}{27y^2}}\right) \\ + \frac{2\pi^2}{|x|} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \delta_{\mathrm{sgn}(x),-\mathrm{sgn}(y)},\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}(x)$ denotes the sign of x. The explicit calculation of this can be found in the appendix. The last term comes from the continuous set of critical points, and clearly dominates over the isolated critical points for large r_0 (or $x \sim 0$). The second term appears to have a pole at $2x - 3y = 0$, but this is just a consequence of the approximate treatment with the Gaussian integration. Indeed there is no such a singular behavior of Ψ, as can be checked by an exact formula below.

Because of the simplicity of the current model, it is also possible to obtain an exact expression of the important contribution. The calculation is shown in the appendix, and the result is:

$$\Psi(x,y) = i\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\phi_3 f(x,y,\phi_3 + i\lambda) + \frac{2\pi^2}{|x|} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \delta_{\mathrm{sgn}(x),-\mathrm{sgn}(y)}. \tag{23}$$

Here $f(x,y,\phi_3)$ is defined in (43), and λ is an arbitrary real number with $\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda) = \mathrm{sgn}(y)$. This is obtained by considering a contour integration shown in Fig.4 to single out the contribution of a pole. This expression does not anymore depend on the regularization parameter ϵ, since the first term is a non-singular convergent integration with an exponential damping behavior of the integrand $\sim \exp(-3y\lambda\phi_3^2)$. The second term is exactly the contribution of the continuous critical points for large r_0, so the stationary phase approximation above seems to work really well for a large space of critical points.

4.1 Asymmetric configuration

We showed that for small x the behavior of $\Psi(x,y)$ is dominated by the continuous critical points. We will now show that the symmetric configuration is the preferred configuration.

Let us first note that the situation of (21) is rather special. If Q does not have a certain symmetry, then such a continuous set of critical points will in general not exist. In the case of $N = 3$ it can actually be shown explicitly that any other additional non-symmetric terms in (18) will remove the continuous set of critical points in favor of a number of isolated points. If an asymmetric term is parametrized by z, then taking the limit $z \to 0$ moves these isolated points to the circle defined by (21).

From this and earlier discussions we expect that adding an asymmetric term disrupts the symmetry and Ψ will be suppressed. The simplest way to disrupt the symmetry would be to allow Q_{113} and Q_{223} to take different values:

$$Q_{113} \equiv \frac{x_1}{3} \neq Q_{223} \equiv \frac{x_2}{3},$$



Figure 1: Numerical integration of (26) with $y = -1, \epsilon = 0.0001$. The left figure plots the values of $|\Psi(x,z)|^2$ against x, z. For z we used a step of $\Delta z = 0.0025$ and for x a step of $\Delta x = 0.05$. The function peaks around $z = 0$, which is what would be expected considering the original hypothesis. For $x \to 0^+$ the function diverges as expected from (22) or (23). The right figure shows the same data in terms of a contour plot, and more details of $|\Psi|^2$ in its lower values are apparent.

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{333} &\equiv y, \\ \text{others} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The integral is given by:

$$\Psi(x_1, x_2, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \; e^{i(\phi_1^2+\phi_2^2+\phi_3^2+x_1\phi_1^2\phi_3+x_2\phi_2^2\phi_3+y\phi_3^3)-\epsilon\phi^2}. \tag{25}$$

After performing the integration over ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 one finds:

$$\Psi(x,z,y) = i\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\phi_3 \, \frac{e^{i(\phi_3^2+y\phi_3^3)-\epsilon\phi_3^2}}{\sqrt{1+(x+z)\phi_3+i\epsilon}\sqrt{1+(x-z)\phi_3+i\epsilon}}. \tag{26}$$

Here we have introduced $x = \frac{x_1+x_2}{2}$ and $z = \frac{x_1-x_2}{2}$. This parametrization is mainly chosen because one can now identify the symmetric configuration by simply setting $z = 0$. For $z = 0$ this integral reduces to (43). Although it proves quite difficult to solve this integral analytically, it can be evaluated numerically quite well.

As can be seen in Fig.1, $|\Psi|^2$ clearly peaks at $z = 0$, which indicates that the system prefers symmetric configurations. We also studied the region $x < 0$ with $y = -1$ numerically, but have not observed any interesting behavior. These seem to confirm our expectations, as there is either no real solution to (21) in that case, or the solution has very small r_0.

The above numerical study is just one of the possible asymmetric terms, one more will now be investigated before making some more general (but local) statements. Instead of (24)



Figure 2: Numerical integration of the integral in (29) with $y = -1, \epsilon = 0.0001$. The left figure plots the values of $|\Psi(x,z)|^2$ against x, z. For z we used a step of $\Delta z = 0.125$ and for x a step of $\Delta x = 0.125$. The function peaks around $z = 0$, which is what would be expected considering the original hypothesis. For $x \to 0^+$ the function diverges as expected from (22) or (23). The right figure shows the same data in terms of a contour plot, and more details of $|\Psi|^2$ in its lower values are apparent.

we now take:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{113} &= Q_{223} \equiv \frac{x}{3}, \\ Q_{333} &\equiv y, \\ Q_{122} &= \frac{z}{3}. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

All other terms (of course with the exception of permutation of indices) are again put to zero. The following integral now needs to be solved:

$$\Psi(x,y,z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \; e^{i(\phi_1^2(1+x\phi_3)+\phi_2^2(1+x\phi_3+z\phi_1)+\phi_3^2+y\phi_3^3)-\epsilon\phi^2}. \tag{28}$$

The ϕ_2 integration can be done readily, which gives:

$$\Psi(x,y,z) = e^{i\pi/4}\sqrt{\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d\phi_1 d\phi_3 \frac{e^{i(\phi_1^2(1+x\phi_3)+\phi_3^2+y\phi_3^3)-\epsilon(\phi_1^2+\phi_3^2)}}{\sqrt{1+x\phi_3+z\phi_1+i\epsilon}}. \tag{29}$$

This double integration can be done numerically and the result is shown in Fig.2. The result is similar to Fig.1, supporting the generality of the phenomenon.

4.2 Perturbations

By adding certain asymmetric terms, we have seen that the symmetric configurations seem to be preferred. To be more general one can look at general small perturbations around the

symmetric configurations to make local statements. Let the tensor given in (17) be denoted by Q^0 and its corresponding action, (18), by S_0. $\Psi(Q)$ can be written, at least formally, for small perturbations $Q = Q^0 + \delta Q$ as:

$$\Psi(Q^0 + \delta Q) = \Psi(Q^0) + \sum_{n>0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \frac{1}{n!} (i\delta Q \phi^3)^n e^{iS_0(\phi) - \epsilon\phi^2}. \tag{30}$$

Considering the first order term in δQ we get an integral like:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \, \phi_a \phi_b \phi_c \, e^{i(\phi^2 + x(\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2)\phi_3 + y\phi_3^3) - \epsilon\phi^2}. \tag{31}$$

Note however that any term which is odd in ϕ_1 or ϕ_2 will vanish, since the whole integrand is then odd in ϕ_1 or ϕ_2. There is actually just one term (which is not present in the unperturbed function) which is not odd but also vanishes:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \, (\phi_1^2 \phi_3 - \phi_2^2 \phi_3) e^{i(\phi^2 + x(\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2)\phi_3 + y\phi_3^3) - \epsilon\phi^2} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \, \phi_1^2 \phi_3 e^{iS_0 - \epsilon\phi^2} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \, \phi_2^2 \phi_3 e^{iS_0 - \epsilon\phi^2} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This means that $\partial\Psi/\partial Q_{abc}|_{Q=Q^0} \, \delta Q_{abc} = 0$ for any perturbations δQ transverse to the symmetric configurations. Therefore, $\Psi(Q^0)$ is a local extremum with respect to the transverse directions. In general the second derivative will not be negative, as is what one would expect for a local maximum. However, in the region where the continuous critical points are important, $Q = Q^0$ becomes a local maximum of $|\Psi(Q)|$ with respect to the transverse directions. This can be qualitatively shown by using that ϕ is dominated by the critical value ϕ^σ in such a region:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi(Q^0)^* \left. \frac{\partial^2 \Psi(Q)}{\partial Q_{abc} \partial Q_{def}} \right|_{Q=Q^0} \delta Q_{abc} \delta Q_{def} \\
&= -\Psi(Q^0)^* \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\phi \, \left(\delta Q \phi^3 \right)^2 \, e^{iS_0(\phi, x, y) - \epsilon\phi^2} \\
&\approx -\left\langle \left(\delta Q (\phi_h^\sigma)^3 \right)^2 \right\rangle_H |\Psi(Q^0)|^2 < 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where we used the short-hand notation $\delta Q \phi^3 \equiv \delta Q_{abc} \phi_a \phi_b \phi_c$, and $\langle \cdots \rangle_H$ denotes taking an average over the group trajectory of H. This can be shown by only considering the term of the relevant continuous critical point in the expression (9) and putting $\phi \approx \phi_h^\sigma$. With $\partial\Psi/\partial Q_{abc}|_{Q=Q^0} \, \delta Q_{abc} = 0$, (32) proves $|\Psi(Q)|^2$ takes a local maximum at $Q = Q_0$ with respect to the transverse directions to the symmetric configurations. This qualitative proof of the relation between classicality and maximality is generally valid for any symmetric configurations and N. Here, the existence of the imaginary unit is essentially important for the appearance of the minus sign in (32), and therefore the relation should be considered to be a characteristic of the Lorentzian treatment. The stationary points of the action are often regarded as the 'classical path' of a system, and this seems to confirm that in this 'classical limit' the system prefers symmetric configurations.

5 $N = 4$

In the case of $N = 3$ there was only one Lie group which was non-trivially possible. In the case of $N = 4$, there are three possible Lie Groups: $SO(2)$, $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$. However, it turns out that the $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ solution is either trivial or reduces to a $SO(2)$ solution. In what follows we will first consider $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ and $SO(2)$.

By $O(N)$ rotations, the $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ generators for $N = 4$ can be put in the following representation:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_1 & 0 & 0 \\ -t_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & -t_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{33}$$

Here t_1 and t_2 are arbitrary parameters for which we take $t_1 > 0, t_2 \geq 0$, so (33) contains two generators. However, it turns out that in order to solve (16) there are only two possible values of t_2: $t_2 = 0$ or $t_2 = 2t_1$[5]. Other values of t_2 will lead to a trivial solution ($Q_{abc} = 0$). Since there is only one generator in both cases $t_2 = 0, 2t_1$, this is just a representation of $SO(2)$. This kind of 'charge quantization' is a result of the fact that there is no unrestricted (charge=0) parameter, like y in (17). In general for any N, symmetric configurations of Q will get more freedom by such 'charge quantization'.

For $t_2 = 0$ the following symmetric tensor solves (16):

$$\begin{gathered} Q_{113} = Q_{223} = x_1, Q_{114} = Q_{224} = x_2, \\ Q_{333} = y_1, Q_{444} = y_2, Q_{334} = z_1, Q_{344} = z_2. \end{gathered} \tag{34}$$

All other terms (of course with the exception of permutation of indices) are again put to zero. The same methods as before can now be used to find the critical points. The specific expressions are nontrivial and not very relevant for the discussion, but the critical points again admit a solution of the form $\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2 = r_0^2, \phi_3 = \text{constant}, \phi_4 = \text{constant}$. This is also what we expect, since the critical points need to admit a SO(2) symmetry represented as the rotations of $\phi_{1,2}$.

For $t_2 = 2t_1$ there is a more restricted set of parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{114} &= -Q_{224} = -Q_{123}, \\ Q_{113} &= -Q_{223} = Q_{124}. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

All other terms (of course with the exception of permutation of indices) are again put to zero. This gives, besides an isolated critical point, also a coupled solution $\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2 = 2(\phi_3^2 + \phi_4^2) = r_0^2$.

We have performed some numerical investigations under some perturbations around the symmetric configurations for this case, too. We have obtained similar results as the $N = 3$ case: strong peaks on the symmetric configurations.

[5]There is also a solution for $2t_2 = t_1$, but this leads to no new results.

The other possible symmetry is SO(3). It turns out that this solution is really similar to SO(2) for $N = 3$. SO(3) has three independent generators:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{36}$$

(16) now gives the following nonzero terms (up to permutations of the indices):

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{114} = Q_{224} = Q_{334} \equiv x, \\ Q_{444} \equiv y. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

All other terms (of course with the exception of permutation of indices) are again put to zero. The critical points now have the topology of a 2-sphere, S^2. The quantity (13) can also be reduced to a single integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(Q) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi \; e^{i\left(\phi_1^2+\phi_2^2+\phi_3^2+\phi_4^2+x(\phi_1^2+\phi_2^2+\phi_3^2)\phi_4+y\phi_4^3\right)-\epsilon\phi^2} \\ &= \pi\sqrt{\pi}e^{i3\pi/4}\int_{\mathbb{R}} d\phi_4 \frac{e^{i(\phi_4^2+y\phi_4^3)-\epsilon\phi_4^2}}{(1+x\phi_4+i\epsilon)^{3/2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

By considering allowing $Q_{114} \neq Q_{224} \neq Q_{334} \neq Q_{114}$ from the symmetric configurations, certain asymmetric configurations can be evaluated. This will again give just a single integral which is reasonably computable numerically:

$$\Psi(Q) = \pi\sqrt{\pi}e^{i3\pi/4}\int_{\mathbb{R}} d\phi_4 \; \frac{e^{i(\phi_4^2+y\phi_4^3)-\epsilon\phi_4^2}}{\sqrt{1+x_1\phi_4+i\epsilon}\sqrt{1+x_2\phi_4+i\epsilon}\sqrt{1+x_3\phi_4+i\epsilon}}. \tag{39}$$

Again, setting $x_1 = x_2 = x_3$ in this parametrization gives the $SO(3)$ symmetric configurations. Numerical calculations show that this is indeed the preferred configuration, as given in Fig.3. In the figure, one can also observe lower peaks emanating in three directions, $z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0, z_1 = z_2$, respectively, which are the $SO(2)$ symmetric configurations.

The $N = 4$ case demonstrates an interesting aspect of the mechanism explained in section 2. Though the critical points of $SO(3)$ are expected to have a larger individual contribution to Ψ (in other words; a higher peak) since the space of the critical points is larger, the configuration space with SO(2) symmetry is always larger. This interplay between the size of the critical points space and the size of the configuration space with a certain symmetry is expected to be important in the large scale behavior of, for instance, the canonical tensor model.

6 Summary and future prospects

An important unsolved question in quantum gravity is how a macroscopic spacetime like the universe can emerge from a, probably chaotic, micrscopic theory. A few recent developments



Figure 3: Numerical integration of the integral in (39) with $x_1 = 0.3, y = -1, \epsilon = 0.0001$. The left figure plots the values of $|\Psi(z_1, z_2)|^2$ against z_1, z_2, where $x_2 = x_1 + z_1, x_3 = x_1 + z_2$. We used a step of $\Delta z_{1,2} = 0.001$. The function peaks around $z_1 = z_2 = 0$, which is what would be expected considering the original hypothesis. The right figure shows the same data in terms of a contour plot, and more details of $|\Psi|^2$ in its lower values are apparent.

suggest the importance of Lorentz treatment in such emergence [1, 3, 4]. In view of this, we have proposed a simple mechanism of highlighted partial symmetries based on collective quantum coherence. Starting from a widely used setup with underlying symmetries, we have shown that partially symmetric configurations are highlighted by collective quantum coherence over chaotic backgrounds. Qualitative arguments show that configurations with partial symmetries with large dimensional representations are preferred. This seems to be in accord with the present form of the universe: relatively small dimensional symmetries like Poincare/de Sitter symmetries represented on the universe, which is huge. As concrete demonstrations, we have shown the occurrence of the phenomenon in some simple computable examples in the randomly connected tensor network [6, 7, 8], which is tightly related to the canonical tensor model [10, 11], a model of quantum gravity. We have observed strikingly sharp highlighting of configurations with Abelian/non-Abelian symmetries, and also observed the phenomenon of charge quantization even in the Abelian case. Wether macroscopic spacetimes can be generated through the mechanism in the canonical tensor model will be an immediate future study.

A crucial difference between the Lorentzian treatment and the Euclidean one in our general setup is that the former prefers a configuration with collective coherent contributions, while the latter prefers one with a minimum value as each. Therefore, the former configuration generally consists of a large number[6] of equally important contributions, while the latter tends to consist of a single contribution. The collective aspect of the former reminds us of the thermodynamic description of spacetime physics [18, 19, 20, 21], which has been argued for a long time but has not been settled in a complete manner. Presently, it is far out of our scope to pursuit

[6]In our examples, the contributions are continuously parametrized.

the connection between our argument and the thermodynamic description of spacetime, but would provide an interesting future direction.

Another interesting observation is that the highlighting is unexpectedly sharp even for small N (and M) at least in our examples, while the general argument of the mechanism suggests that the mechanism works more effectively for larger N and M. This seems to suggest that the mechanism may be used not only as that of highlighted partial symmetries but also as a fine-tuning mechanism of parameters. The cosmological constant problem [22] is known to be the most notorious problem of fine-tuning. It would be highly interesting if the mechanism could give hints to resolutions to these problems.

Acknowledgements

The work of N.S. is supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15K05050. The work of D.O. is supported in part by the Hendrik Mullerfonds. N.S. would like to thank Y. Sato and B. Fraser for some initial discussions during his stay in Chulalongkorn University. We would also like to thank S. Hirano and H. Nielsen for some intriguing discussions in the occasions of their visits to Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics.

A Detailed calculations for $N = 3$

The contribution of the isolated critical points given in (19) and (20) can be obtained by perturbing $S(\phi^\sigma + \delta\phi)$ up to second order and performing Gaussian integration:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(x,y)_{\rm i} &\approx \sum_{\sigma:\text{isolated}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\delta\phi \; e^{iS(\phi^\sigma,x,y)+\frac{i}{2}S^\sigma_{ab}\delta\phi^a\delta\phi^b} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma:\text{isolated}} e^{iS(\phi^\sigma,x,y)} \prod_{l=1}^{3} \left(\frac{2\pi i}{e^\sigma_l}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \pi^{3/2} e^{i3\pi/4} \left(1 + i\left(\frac{3y}{2x-3y}\right) e^{i\frac{4}{27y^2}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Here $S^\sigma_{ab} = \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial\phi^a\partial\phi^b}\Big|_{\phi=\phi^\sigma}$, and e^σ_l are the eigenvalues of the matrix S^σ_{ab}. For the evaluation of the square root we choose the principal square root, giving a branch cut at negative real numbers.

Next we evaluate the continuous set of critical points from (21). Since these critical points are degenerate, it is convenient to integrate out the degeneracy first. For this, polar coordinates, where $\phi_1 = r\cos(\theta), \phi_2 = r\sin(\theta)$, are most convenient since the critical points are degenerate along the angular direction. Plugging these coordinates in (18) gives a trivial integration over θ, removing the degeneracy. The remaining Gaussian integrals can be evaluated

to be:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(x,y)_{\rm c} &\approx 2\pi e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \int r dr\, d\delta\phi_3\; e^{i((1-\frac{3y}{x})\delta\phi_3^2+2r_0x\delta r\delta\phi_3)} \\
&= \frac{2\pi^{3/2}}{\sqrt{1-3y/x}} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} e^{i\pi/4} \int_0^\infty r dr\; e^{-i\frac{r_0^2x^2\delta r^2}{1-3y/x}} \\
&= \frac{2\pi^{3/2}}{\sqrt{1-3y/x}} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} e^{i\pi/4} \int_{-r_0}^\infty (\delta r + r_0) d\delta r\; e^{-i\frac{r_0^2x^2\delta r^2}{1-3y/x}} \\
&= \frac{\pi^2}{|x|} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \left(1+\mathrm{erf}\left(\sqrt{\frac{ix^2r_0^4}{1-3y/x}}\right)\right) \\
&\quad - \pi^{3/2} e^{i3\pi/4} \frac{\sqrt{1-3y/x}}{r_0^2x^2} e^{-i\frac{r_0^4x^2}{1-3y/x}} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \\
&\xrightarrow[r_0\to\infty]{} \frac{2\pi^2}{|x|} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \delta_{\mathrm{sgn}(x),-\mathrm{sgn}(y)},
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where $\delta\phi_3 = \phi_3 - \phi_3^\sigma$, $\delta r = r - r_0$, and $\mathrm{sgn}(x)$ denotes the sign of x. Here the standard integrals $\int dx e^{i\frac{a}{2}x^2+iJx} = \left(\frac{2\pi i}{a}\right)^{1/2} e^{-i\frac{J^2}{2a}}$, $\int_{-b}^\infty dx x e^{i\frac{a}{2}x^2} = \frac{i}{a} e^{i\frac{a}{2}b^2}$ and $\int_{-b}^\infty dx e^{-iax^2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2\sqrt{ia}}\left(1+\mathrm{erf}(\sqrt{iab^2})\right)$ were used. In the last step the $r_0 \to \infty$ limit was taken for which we suspect the critical points to be most relevant. This limit only really makes sense for the case that $\mathrm{sgn}(x) = -\mathrm{sgn}(y)$, as can be seen by inspection of (21).

Because of the simplicity of the current model, it is also possible to do part of the calculation exact. The integral which needs to be solved is:

$$\Psi(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\phi\; e^{i(\phi_1^2+\phi_2^2+\phi_3^2+x(\phi_1^2+\phi_2^2)\phi_3+y\phi_3^3)-\epsilon\phi^2}, \tag{42}$$

where the $-\epsilon\phi^2$ term was added to make sure the integral converges as mentioned in (13). The ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 integrals can be done readily since they are just Gaussian integrals, and using $\int dk e^{iak^2} = \sqrt{i\frac{\pi}{a}}$ one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(x,y) &= i\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\phi_3\; \frac{e^{i(\phi_3^2+y\phi_3^3)-\epsilon\phi_3^2}}{1+x\phi_3+i\epsilon} \\
&\equiv i\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\phi_3 f(x,y,\phi_3).
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Interestingly, the integrand has a simple pole at $\phi_3 = -\frac{1+i\epsilon}{x}$. This value of ϕ_3 indeed agrees with that of the continuous critical point found in (21). This suggests that the contribution of the pole is related to the continuous critical point, as will be shown more explicitly below.

The contribution of the pole of the integration of (43) can be picked out by taking the contour of Fig.4 in the complex ϕ_3 plane. Here, λ is an arbitrary real number, and $\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)$ should be taken the same as $\mathrm{sgn}(y)$, the reason of which will become apparent shortly. The residue theorem then gives:

$$\int_\gamma d\phi_3 f(x,y,\phi_3) = \mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)\, 2\pi i\, \mathrm{Res}\left(f(x,y,\phi_3), -\frac{1}{x}\right)$$



Figure 4: The contour γ in (44). λ must have the same sign as y for the limit $L \to \infty$, and shifts the integration contour of ϕ_3 from (43) to (45). There is a pole at $\phi_3 = -\frac{1+i\epsilon}{x}$ shown by $*$, and only for $\mathrm{sgn}(x) = -\mathrm{sgn}(y)$ the pole will lie inside of the contour. The orientation of the contour depends on the sign of λ, generating the factor of $\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)$ in (44).

$$= -\frac{2\pi i}{|x|} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \delta_{\mathrm{sgn}(x),-\mathrm{sgn}(y)}. \tag{44}$$

So, by taking $L \to \infty$ on account of $\mathrm{sgn}(\lambda)$=$\mathrm{sgn}(y)$, the integral (43) can be rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(x,y) = i\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\phi_3 \; f(x,y,\phi_3 + i\lambda) \\ + \frac{2\pi^2}{|x|} e^{i\frac{x-y}{x^3}} \delta_{\mathrm{sgn}(x),-\mathrm{sgn}(y)}. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

In the derivation, we have used the fact that the integrand damps exponentially $\sim \exp(-3y\lambda\phi_3^2)$. An advantage of the expression is that the regularization with ϵ is not necessary anymore, since the first integration is non-singular. From (41), it can be seen that the continuous critical point governs the behaviour of the residue of the pole for $r_0 \to \infty$ (or $x \sim 0$).

References

[1] J. Ambjorn, J. Jurkiewicz, and R. Loll, "Emergence of a 4-D world from causal quantum gravity", *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 93, p. 131 301, 2004. arXiv: `hep-th/0404156 [hep-th]`.

[2] D. Coumbe and J. Laiho, "Exploring Euclidean Dynamical Triangulations with a Non-trivial Measure Term", *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 028, 2015. arXiv: `1401.3299 [hep-th]`.

[3] M. Van Raamsdonk, "Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement", *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, vol. 42, pp. 2323–2329, 2010, [Int. J. Mod. Phys.D19,2429(2010)]. arXiv: `1005.3035 [hep-th]`.

[4] J. Feldbrugge, J.-L. Lehners, and N. Turok, "Lorentzian Quantum Cosmology", 2017. arXiv: `1703.02076 [hep-th]`.

[5] D. Baumann, "Inflation", in *PHYSICS OF THE LARGE AND THE SMALL, TASI 09, PROCEEDINGS OF THE THEORETICAL ADVANCED STUDY INSTITUTE IN ELEMENTARY PARTICLE PHYSICS, BOULDER, COLORADO, USA, 1-26 JUNE 2009*, 2011, pp. 523–686. arXiv: `0907.5424 [hep-th]`. [Online]. Available: `https://inspirehep.net/record/827549/files/arXiv:0907.5424.pdf`.

[6] N. Sasakura and Y. Sato, "Ising model on random networks and the canonical tensor model", *PTEP*, vol. 2014, no. 5, 053B03, 2014. arXiv: 1401.7806 [hep-th].

[7] N. Sasakura and Y. Sato, "Exact Free Energies of Statistical Systems on Random Networks", *SIGMA*, vol. 10, p. 087, 2014. arXiv: 1402.0740 [hep-th].

[8] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, "Critical phenomena in complex networks", *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 80, pp. 1275–1335, 4 Oct. 2008. [Online]. Available: https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.80.1275.

[9] G. Narain, N. Sasakura, and Y. Sato, "Physical states in the canonical tensor model from the perspective of random tensor networks", *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 010, 2015. arXiv: 1410.2683 [hep-th].

[10] N. Sasakura, "Canonical tensor models with local time", *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, vol. A27, p. 1 250 020, 2012. arXiv: 1111.2790 [hep-th].

[11] N. Sasakura, "Uniqueness of canonical tensor model with local time", *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, vol. A27, p. 1 250 096, 2012. arXiv: 1203.0421 [hep-th].

[12] J. Ambjorn, B. Durhuus, and T. Jonsson, "Three-dimensional simplicial quantum gravity and generalized matrix models", *Mod. Phys. Lett.*, vol. A6, pp. 1133–1146, 1991.

[13] N. Sasakura, "Tensor model for gravity and orientability of manifold", *Mod. Phys. Lett.*, vol. A6, pp. 2613–2624, 1991.

[14] N. Godfrey and M. Gross, "Simplicial quantum gravity in more than two-dimensions", *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D43, pp. 1749–1753, 1991.

[15] R. Wong, *Asymptotic approximations of integrals.*: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2001. [Online]. Available: http://epubs.siam.org/doi/book/10.1137/1.9780898719260.

[16] E. Witten, "Analytic Continuation Of Chern-Simons Theory", *AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math.*, vol. 50, pp. 347–446, 2011. arXiv: 1001.2933 [hep-th].

[17] D. L. Bennett, N. Brene, and H. B. Nielsen, "Random Dynamics", *Phys. Scripta*, vol. T15, p. 158, 1987.

[18] J. D. Bekenstein, "Black holes and entropy", *Phys. Rev.*, vol. D7, pp. 2333–2346, 1973.

[19] T. Jacobson, "Thermodynamics of space-time: The Einstein equation of state", *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 75, pp. 1260–1263, 1995. arXiv: gr-qc/9504004 [gr-qc].

[20] T. Padmanabhan, "Thermodynamical Aspects of Gravity: New insights", *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, vol. 73, p. 046 901, 2010. arXiv: 0911.5004 [gr-qc].

[21] E. P. Verlinde, "On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton", *JHEP*, vol. 04, p. 029, 2011. arXiv: 1001.0785 [hep-th].

[22] S. Weinberg, "The Cosmological Constant Problem", *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 61, pp. 1–23, 1989.